



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE OLYMPIC VICTORY OF AGIAS OF THESSALY

BY KENDALL K. SMITH

Inscribed upon a long pedestal¹ at Delphi, beneath one of the nine cavities cut in the top to receive the plinths of statues, are these elegiac verses:

Πρῶτος Ὀλύμπια παγκράτιον, Φαρσάλιε, νίκας
Ἄγία Ἀκονίου, γῆς ἀπὸ Θεσσαλίας,
πεντάκις ἐν Νεμέᾳ, τρὶς Πύθια, πεντάκις Ἴσθμοι·
καὶ σὼν οὐδεὶς πω στήσῃ τροπαῖα χερῶν.²

According to this inscription we have in Agias the first Thessalian to win the pancratium at Olympia. My object in this paper is to propose a date for that victory, the importance of which is not limited merely to the field of historical research but has also its bearing upon the history of Greek literature. For as long as the victory of Timodemus, the Athenian pancratiast, is left undated, so long will the dating of Pindar's second Nemean ode³ and its position among his works remain in doubt. Any narrowing of the field brings nearer the solution of that literary problem, and may ultimately decide the disputes of Fraccaroli, Schmidt, Christ, and others.⁴ Since Agias was the first Thessalian to win the pancratium at Olympia, his victory must come before 408 B. C., for another Thessalian, Polydamas, won in that year.⁵ Therefore, he belongs in the fifth century at the latest. If the date proposed in this paper be accepted, Christ's dating of the second Nemean ode in the years 459–51 B. C. will have to be given up, and choice made between the extremes, either before 480 B. C., or after 448 B. C.⁶

¹ *Am. Jour. Arch.* XIII (1909), pp. 447 ff.

² *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), pp. 592, 593.

³ Schol. Nem. 2, 4: μετὰ γὰρ τὴν Νεμεακὴν νίκην ἐστεφανοῦτο τὰ Ὀλύμπια (Boeckh *Pindari Opera* II, Pt. 1, p. 436).

⁴ See C. Gaspar *Essai de chronologie Pindarique*, pp. 51–53.

⁵ Paus. 6, 5, 1 ff.; 7, 27, 6; H. Foerster *Die Sieger in den olympischen Spielen*, p. 21, no. 279.

⁶ The interval being covered by the Oxyrhynchus papyrus published by C. Robert, *Hermes* XXXV (1900), pp. 141–95.

Shortly after the discovery of the inscription, Homolle¹ proposed the date 428 B. C., for the *floruit* of Agias, but did not suggest any date for his Olympic victory. Preuner,² in accepting the dating of Daochus, the son, between 431 and 404 B. C., set the victory of Agias before the middle of the fifth century. He had no means of arriving at a more exact date, since the Oxyrhynchus papyrus,³ which gives the names of victors at Olympia between 480 and 448 B. C., was not then published. This papyrus appeared so soon after his work that its publisher, C. Robert, could not avail himself of Preuner's hints, or may have overlooked Agias altogether, since no mention is made of him. No one, so far as I know, has yet brought the inscription at Delphi into connection with the Oxyrhynchus papyrus, either to fill the lacunae or to supplement it in the years beyond the point where it stops.

With Robert's restorations the papyrus contains only one lacuna in the list of pancratiast victors. This is the year 460 B. C. The following Olympic years through 448 B. C. are filled. Between 448 and 408 B. C., the year of the victory of Polydamas, there remain unfilled the dates 444, 440, 436, and either 416 or 412 B. C.⁴

The choice among these dates depends almost entirely on the date of Daochus, the son of Agias. If, as Homolle,⁵ Preuner,⁶ Kent,⁷ and Meyer⁸ agree, this Daochus was ἄρχων of all Thessaly during, or not later than, the period 431–404 B. C., it seems more reasonable to date his father's victory in 460 B. C., i. e., thirty years before, than in even the earliest of the next possible dates, 444 B. C., only thirteen years before. For, the latter date requires us to assume either that Daochus became ἄρχων when still a boy, or, supposing him to have been

¹ *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), pp. 595, 596.

² E. Preuner *Ein delphisches Weihgeschenk*, p. 17.

³ *Hermes* XXXV (1900), pp. 141–95.

⁴ The victors in the other years are:

432 B. C.	} Dorieus of Rhodes (Foerster, Nos. 258, 260, 262).
428	
424	
420	
416 or 412	Androstenes (Foerster, No. 267).
	Androstenes, 2d victory (Foerster, No. 272).

—H. Foerster, *Die Sieger in den olympischen Spielen*, pp. 19, 20.

⁵ *Bull. Cor. Hell.*, loc. cit.

⁶ Preuner *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁷ R. G. Kent *A History of Thessaly from the Earliest Historical Times to the Accession of Philip V of Macedonia*, pp. 9–10, 18, 19.

Cf. E. Meyer *Theopomps Hellenika*, pp. 247 ff. He gives as dates ca. 445–415 B. C.

no more than twenty at that time, that Agias, his father, had been married some eight years and was about thirty-eight years old when he won his victory. Then, as we raise the son's age, the father's increases as well. However nominal this office of ἄρχων may have been, an age of thirty seems none too young at which to take it up. If, indeed, he was thirty in 431 B. C., his father must have been married in 462 B. C. (or earlier, since we cannot say that Daochus was the oldest son. He is certainly not named for his grandfather). And if Agias married in 462 B. C., even supposing him to have been only twenty-two, then a victory in 444 B. C., eighteen years later, would bring him into his fortieth year. For these reasons, the placing of the rule of Daochus between 431 and 404 B. C. seems bound to carry his father's victory back before 444 B. C., hence to 460 B. C.

The authority for this extraordinarily long rule of twenty-seven years, unrecorded elsewhere in history, comes from an inscription¹ on the same long pedestal at Delphi on which Agias is commemorated. The details given of a rule over all Thessaly "not by force but legally," together with what is otherwise known about Thessalian affairs, suggest that this was an elective office with few real powers. Now, after Lycophron's victory in 404 B. C.,² there was no peaceful stretch of twenty-seven years in Thessalian history until the days of Macedonian dominion. In 431 B. C.,³ Thessalian contingents came to Athens not from any central government but by cities. Into the intervening period the rule of Daochus just fits.

One slight fact points to the location of supreme authority in the year 424 B. C. at Pharsalus, the home of Daochus.⁴ Brasidas in that year attempted to pass through Thessaly and sent a messenger to friends of his in Pharsalus, by whose help, or rather, by rapid marching, he succeeded in getting through the country.⁵ Thessaly during this period was a neutral, and the peace and plenty recorded in the inscription may reflect this attitude.

Bull. Cor. Hell. XXI (1897), p. 593:

Δάοχος Ἀγία εἰμί, πατρίς Φάρσαλος, ἀπάσης
Θεσσαλίας ἀρχεὺς οὐ βία ἀλλὰ νόμῳ
ἔπτα καὶ εἰκοσι ἔτη· πολλῇ δὲ καὶ ἀγλαοκάρπῳ
εἰρήνῃ πλούτῳ τε ἔβρυνε Θεσσαλία.

² *Xen. Hell.* 2, 3, 4.

³ *Thuc.* 2, 22, 3.

⁴ Brought forward by R. G. Kent *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 18, 19.

⁵ *Thuc.* 4, 78, 1.

The chief support, however, for this date must come from the dates of the son and grandson of Daochus, both of whom are commemorated by inscriptions on the family pedestal at Delphi.¹ Sisyphus,² the son, was a brave warrior; Daochus II, the grandson, was tetrarch of Thessaly and hieromnemon of the Amphictyons at the time when he dedicated this monument to his family.³ In the case of Daochus II it has been shown by Homolle⁴ and Preuner⁵ that he must have held these offices between 339 and 332 B. C., and that he was active politically as early as 352 B. C. If we take 338 B. C. as a working date and compute each generation at 33 years—the number found most workable by Kirchner in his *Prosopographia Attica*—the time between 404 and 338 B. C. is seen to cover exactly the required span of two generations, sixty-six years. In other words, the known date of the grandson harmonizes with the assumed final date of the grandfather.

By the same method of calculation we secure as the corresponding date in the life of Sisyphus 371 B. C. (338+33). Is it possible that this is the same Sisyphus mentioned in the history of Theopompus,⁶

¹ For reference a family tree is given here:

	Aparus	<i>Flor.</i>
	Acnonius	518 B. C.
Telemachus	Agias	485 B. C.
	Agelaus	452 B. C.
	Daochus I (431-404)	419 B. C.
	Sisyphus I	386 B. C.
	Daochus II (339-332)	353 B. C.
	Sisyphus II	320 B. C.

² *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), pp. 593, 594:

Οὐκ ἔψευσέ σε Παλλὰς ἐν ὑπνῳ, Δαόχου νιέ
 Σίσυφε, ἀ δ' εἶπε σαφῇ θῆκεν ὑποσχέσιαν
 ἐξ οὗ γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ἔδυσ περὶ τεύχεα χρωτί,
 οὐτ' ἔφυνγες δηλοῖς οὔτε τι τραῦμ' ἔλαβες.

³ *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), p. 594:

Αὔξων οἰκείων προγόνων ἀρετὰς τάδε δῶρα
 στήσεμ Φοῖβῳ ἀνακτι, γένος καὶ πατρίδα τιμῶν,
 Δαόχος εὐδόξῳ χρώμενος εὐλογία,
 τέτταρχος Θεσσαλῶν,
 ἱερομνήμων Ἀμφικτυόνων.

⁴ *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), p. 595.

⁵ Preuner *op. cit.*, pp. 7-12.

⁶ Theopomp. ap. Athen. 6, 252F.

and so necessarily active in or before 394 B. C., the year with which the history concludes? To have been a prominent figure in 394 B. C., or earlier, he must have been born not far from 425 B. C. Then in 371 B. C. he would have been about fifty-five years old. If, then, for purposes of computation, we consider that one generation or 33 years later (i. e., 338 B. C.), Daochus II was also fifty-five, he must have been fifty when appointed tetrarch and have worked in Philip's interest at the age of forty-one; none of which are unreasonable ages. Then, turning to Daochus I, if we assume that in 404 B. C. he also was fifty-five, we obtain the not improbable age of twenty-eight for his election(?) as ruler of Thessaly.¹

Or, if we apply the test of generations to the date of Agias himself, quite apart from the twenty-seven years of his son's rule, we obtain fresh support for the year 460 B. C. as opposed to 444 B. C. For, the calculation by intervals of thirty-three years gives to Agias the year 437 B. C., as the date toward the end of his career corresponding with the age fifty-five computed for his descendants. If, now, we consider him to have been fifty-five years old in 437 B. C., it is impossible that his great Olympic victory came in 444 B. C., when he would have been forty-eight years old. Even if we assume that there was a variation of ten years from the iron-clad succession of generations that we have been using, he remains thirty-eight at the time of his victory. On the other hand, the date 460 B. C. allows us to retain the full length of the generations and makes his age when he won, thirty-two.²

Thus the calculation by generations is not only in complete accord with the supposition that Agias' son was ruler of Thessaly in 431-404 B. C., which carries with it a preference for the date 460 B. C., but independently favors that date itself. The foundations of such an argument as this are admittedly weak. Hypothesis rests on hypothesis. But the resultant date is certainly reasonable. I have no doubt that the correct date is either 460 or 444 B. C. The facts at

¹ Indeed, if any change is desired, it would be towards adding to his age, therewith increasing the probability that the Sisyphus of 371 B. C. was the Sisyphus of 394 B. C.

² Whether his other victories—3 Pythian, 5 Nemean, 5 Isthmian—were grouped around, preceded, or came after his Olympic victory, we cannot say. They cover a period of at least nine years. But even if they all preceded it and it was the culmination of his athletic career, he can have won his first victory in 470 B. C., at the age of twenty-two.

present ascertainable seem to point rather to the former year. In this I have the support of Preuner, who looked for a date before the middle of the century. This can only be 460 B. C. If we place his victory in that year, we can fill the lacuna in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus and complete the list of winners in the pancratium between 480 and 448 B. C. Then the victory of Timodemus, which Robert wanted to place in 460 B. C.¹ and which must have come there to maintain Christ's dating of the second Nemean ode, will have to fall outside this period, and be dated either before 480 or after 448 B. C.

There is one uncomfortable doubt still left undecided. Did Telemachus, the brother of Agias, also win an Olympic victory? The inscription² on the pedestal states that on the same days he won the same number of crowns at wrestling as his brother did in the pancratium. If one of them was won at Olympia, we shall be obliged either to move to 464 B. C. (which is vacant) Amesinas of Cyrene, whose victory in wrestling is placed in 460 B. C. by Julius Africanus,³ or else transfer Agias to 444 B. C. The indefiniteness of the inscription, however, and its omission to speak of an Olympic victory by name, lead me to believe that while Telemachus may have won as many times as his brother, he did not win at Olympia, and that *ἡμασι τοῖς αὐτοῖς* cannot be pressed too literally. I have not allowed this point to enter into the argument because of its uncertainty. And if it is felt that the inscription does intend to attribute to him an Olympic victory in the same year with Agias, I should be inclined to question the accuracy of the dating of Amesinas rather than to remove Agias from 460 to 444 B. C.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

¹ *Hermes* XXXV (1900), p. 183.

² *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), p. 593:

Κάγῳ τοῦδε ὁμάδελφο[s ἔ]φυν, ἀριθμὸν δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν
ἡμασι τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐχφ[έρ]ομαι στεφάνων
νικῶν μονοπάλ[ης], Τ[υο]σηνῶν δὲ ἀνδρα κράτιστον
κτεῖνα, ἐθέλοντο[s εὖν· Τ]ηλέμαχος δ' ὄνομα.

³ *Euseb. Chron.* I, 203; H. Foerster *op. cit.*, p. 16, no. 225.